

## REMARKS

### 103 Rejections

Claims 1-3, and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adelman et al. (U.S. Patent 4,748,620) in view of Badger et al. (U.S. Patent 5,606,559). Applicants respectfully submit that the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1-3, and 6-12 is neither shown nor suggested by the Adelman et al. reference alone or in combination with the Badger et al. reference. Specifically, Applicants respectfully point out that Independent Claim 1 (from which Claims 2-3 depend) explicitly recites a mechanism for handling units of data based on a destination address of said packets. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to page 8, line 28 to page 10, line 33 of the present specification wherein support and background for the invention of Claim 1 can be found. Applicants have reviewed the Adelman et al. and Badger et al. references (and the portions thereof cited by the Examiner), and Applicants respectfully contend that the references neither show nor suggest a mechanism for handling units of data based on a destination address of said packets, as is recited and claimed in the present Application.

Similarly, Applicants respectfully point out that Independent Claim 6 (from which Claims 7-10 depend) explicitly recites reordering packets of data based on a destination address of said packets. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to page 8, line 28 to page 10, line 33 of the present specification wherein support and background for the invention of Claim 6 can be found. Applicants have reviewed the Adelman et al. and Badger et al. references (and the portions thereof cited by the Examiner), and Applicants respectfully contend that the references neither show nor suggest reordering packets of data based on a

destination address of said packets, as is recited and claimed in the present Application.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully point out that Independent Claim 11 (from which Claim 12 depends) explicitly recites a mechanism for scheduling units of data received based on a destination address of said units. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to page 8, line 28 to page 10, line 33 of the present specification wherein support and background for the invention of Claim 1 can be found. Applicants have reviewed the Adelman et al. and Badger et al. references (and the portions thereof cited by the Examiner), and Applicants respectfully contend that the references neither show nor suggest a mechanism for scheduling units of data received based on a destination address of said units, as is recited and claimed in the present Application.

#### 102 Rejection

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McClure (U.S. Patent 5,471,472). Applicants respectfully point out that Independent Claim 13 (from which Claims 14-15 depend) explicitly recites a mechanism for scheduling units of data received based on a destination address of said units. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to page 8, line 28 to page 10, line 33 of the present specification wherein support and background for the invention of Claim 13 can be found. Applicants have reviewed the McClure et al. reference (and the portions thereof cited by the Examiner), and Applicants respectfully contend that the reference neither shows nor suggests a mechanism for scheduling units of data received based on a destination address of said units, as is recited and claimed in the present Application.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the present Application.

Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that newly amended Independent Claims 1 and 13 are allowable, and that all remaining dependent Claims (i.e. Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-23, 25-26 and 28-30) depend from respective allowable base Claims. As such, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of all remaining Claims.


Applicants further respectfully point out that no contested Claims remain in the present Application.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 5/31/01

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John P. Wagner, Jr.  
Reg. No.: 35,398

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060